

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

N'GAI GEORGE,

Plaintiff,

v.

STAPLES, INC.,

Defendant.

**Civil Action No. 08-5746(KSH)
(MDL 2025)**

KRYSTAL FLORIO,

Plaintiff,

v.

STAPLES, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 09-1157(KSH)

OMAR MORRISON,

Plaintiff,

v.

STAPLES, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 09-1970(KSH)

ROBERT ZELINSKY,

Plaintiff,

v.

STAPLES, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 09-1889(KSH)

CHRISTOPHER PRICE,

Plaintiff,

v.

STAPLES, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 09-1890(KSH)

VISHAL SHARMA,

Plaintiff,

v.

STAPLES, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 09-1891(KSH)

JEFFREY CIOTTI,

Plaintiff,

v.

STAPLES, INC.,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Civil Action No. 09-1919(KSH)

ORDER ON INFORMAL APPLICATION

This matter having come before the Court by way of letters dated December 2, 2009, regarding a discovery dispute that the defendant seeks to have resolved;

and the Court having entered Orders dated May 13, 2009, August 3, 2009, and November 12, 2009 that specifically set forth the format in which the parties are required to raise discovery disputes;¹

¹The Court set forth a specific format for raising discovery disputes that requires the parties to both confer and work together in good faith to resolve and present discovery disputes. Moreover, the required format assists the Court to efficiently resolve the disputes and ensures that the necessary information is presented in a concise fashion. The Orders require that

Counsel shall confer in a good faith attempt to informally resolve any and all discovery disputes before seeking the Court's intervention. Should such informal effort fail to resolve the dispute, the matter shall be brought to the Court's attention via a joint letter that sets forth: (a) the request, (b) the response; (c) efforts to resolve the dispute; (d) why the complaining party believes the information is relevant and why the responding party's response continues to be deficient; and (e) why the responding party believes the response is sufficient. No further submissions regarding the dispute may be submitted without leave of Court. If necessary, the Court will thereafter schedule a telephone conference to resolve the dispute.

Orders dated May 13, 2009, August 3, 2009, and November 12, 2009.

and it appearing that the December 2, 2009 letter was not submitted in the format required for raising discovery dispute;

and there having been no effort to comply with this requirement, see plaintiff's letter dated December 2, 2009 at 1;

and for the reasons set forth herein;

IT IS THEREFORE ON THIS 2nd day of December, 2009

ORDERED that the request for the relief embodied in the defendant's letter dated December 2, 2009 is denied.

s/Patty Shwartz
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE